Ham-Policy Digest   Fri, 25 Feb 94   Volume 94 : Issue   85

Today's Topics:
                    Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS
                 Industry gets more Amateur Spectrum
        Modern technology (was Re: The *language* requirement!)
     Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)
               Online repeater directory, ARRL opposition
                        Super Morse 4.10 is out!
                      The *language* requirement!
               Two meter frequency allocations (2 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

In article <2kdgai$9oe@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> A great x ray technician!,
xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM writes:
>This brings up another point. The Codeless Technician was SUPPOSED to
>bring in all sorts of technically-advanced people, who were to use
>radio to supplement their research in packet, satellite communication,
>spread spectrum, and so on. Ninety-five percent of all Codeless Techs
>are "ratchet-jawing" (their phrase, not mine) on Two Meter FM.
>Therefore, I submit that the Codeless Technician is NOT being used for
>the stated purpose, and instead being used for Citizen's Band.

Robert,
   I can see why you have the trouble seeing all the wonderful ways we are
exploring amateur radio. If the truth be known, most people find you
terribly offensive, and don't invite you to play......So those of us who
take time to post thought out arguments (you're entitle to not agree, but
we had hoped you might be challenged to write a real rebuttal that could
be construed to be thought out) are spat upon as being lazy? Oh quite
contrare, we have spend much time trying to enlighten you on our point of
view. I have seen many well thought out pro and con statements on the
net, but not with your tag line attached. In fact some of the pro coders
have made an impact on my point of view in their favor........but that
hasn't reduced my contempt for you.
   Since taking my test I have built a couple power amps, taken over a
newsletter in a local club, am involved in building a EME system and
working towards emergency services.......and gee I'm just another lazy
code free tech.
   Please define "ratchet-jawing", as that is the majority of the comms I
hear on HF. Before the flames eat me I know there are many nets that
discuss emergency or technical information, but come on do you really
think that 2 mtrs has a lock on "ratchet-jawing"? Get real

Rick Aldom

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 19:26:30 GMT
From: catfish!cscsun!dtiller@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Industry gets more Amateur Spectrum
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

A great x ray technician! (xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:
: In article <millar.77.000832F7@nhqvax.sanders.lockheed.com>,
: Jeffrey R. Millar <millar@nhqvax.sanders.lockheed.com> wrote:
: >The Commerce Dept, in conjunction with DoD plans to give 200 MHz of spectrum
: >space in the 1200 - 4800 MHz area to industry. This includes 2300-2310 and
: >2402-2417 MHz. One annoying aspect, the 2402-2417 MHz segment goes to
: >industry in August 1994 without a comment and review period.
: >
: >We need to gear up to fight this. Without a 2400 MHz allocation, repeaters
: >in this band won't work.

I'd like to see a slightly wide alloc at the top of the band, i.e. 2475 or so.
(Yes I know that's ISM-land). That's so I can use a microwave magnetron
for ATV...
--
David Tiller | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-3710 |

```
dtiller@rmc.edu  | Randolph-Macon College| Fax:   (804) 752-7231        |
"Drunk, [Beowulf] slew | P.O. Box 5005  | ICBM:  37d 42' 43.75" N      |
no hearth companions." | Ashland, Va 23005 |        77d 31' 32.19" W     |
```

Date: 24 Feb 1994 00:32:45 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!sunspot!myers@ames.arpa
Subject: Modern technology (was Re: The *language* requirement!)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2kgpoi$rp5@chnews.intel.com> jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley,
W5GYJ) writes:
>In article <CLMt8E.3xE@world.std.com>,
>David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> wrote:
>
>>I've been thinking about the morse code requirement in the light of
>>the discussion we've been having on language in this group, and I have
>>an idea...
>
>>I suggest we get rid of the code requirement - and substitute a
>>*language* requirement!...
>
>>There's no reason morse code couldn't be one of the "languages" (if
>>you'll pardon the term) which people could master...
>
>
>You'll get my vote in a nanosecond if you also include computer
>languages on the approved list.

Though it has nothing to do with the "code is a language" argument,
I'd very much like to see the amateur question pools incorporate
questions on the topics of embedded programming and network progamming.

And, yeah, I think the demonstration of knowledge of current languages
such as Pascal and C should count towards elements 1B and 1C. Maybe
50 questions each, each drawn from a pool of 500 questions. Include
debugging, real=time, etc.

Nah... wouldn't want anything relevant to modern radio on the tests. I
had to pass the CW tests we have today, so everyone else should have to.

NOT!

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are *
 * (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

```
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

------------------------------

Date: Wed, 23 Feb 1994 14:58:43 GMT
From: catfish!cscsun!dtiller@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:
: ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV)) writes:

: (Well stated position on code-nocode and hams in general deleted)

: Ed, the only thing I would take exception to (and you mentioned it) is
: that morse is an encryption method not a language. And it IS memorized
: the fact that you have limited time to respond is a conditioned response
: again, not learned. Conditioned. Any one remember Dr. Pavlov?

I don't know beans about Pavlov, but I must agree with Dan in that CW
is not a language.  If it were then I could converse with any other CW
fluent ham without those cute Q signals, could I not?  The fact is we
are merely converting letters and numbers into a shorthand of sounds
suitable to the method of transmission.  Just as a russian document in
ASCII is still unreadable to a non-russian speaking person, so would a
CW transmission be.

PS - I don't like 'encrypt' - that implies attempting to hide the contents
     of the transmission when the actual intent is to facilitate communication.
--
David Tiller  | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-3710        |
dtiller@rmc.edu  | Randolph-Macon College| Fax:   (804) 752-7231        |
"Drunk, [Beowulf] slew | P.O. Box 5005  | ICBM:  37d 42' 43.75" N     |
no hearth companions." | Ashland, Va 23005 |        77d 31' 32.19" W     |

------------------------------

Date: Thu, 24 Feb 1994 15:16:40 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!att-out!walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-
mail@ames.arpa
Subject: Online repeater directory, ARRL opposition
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

This discussion originated in rec.radio.amateur.misc, but I think
it more appropriately belongs in ....policy so here's my post:
```

>William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM wrote:
>: I have a real big problem with the idea that there are deliberate errors
>:purposely induced into a reference book. Maybe we should start
>: a "repeater directory accuracy project" to confirm all the listings in the
>: ARRL directory to see if content errors exist.

My following post includes a layman's set of interpretations/opinions
relative to some legal issues...Bottom line, I'm not a lawyer, but
here's my opinion, treat it accordingly.

First, I'm an ARRL member and a Local Gov't Liason (LGL) in the ARRL field
organization, but that doesn't mean I agree with all positions of ARRL.
I missed the initial thread of this discussion,but from the two recent
posts it appears ARRL has threatened legal action against someone
providing (or intending to provide) an "online" version of a repeater
directory. It also appears that ARRL has determined that some of
the data included in this "online" directory must have been taken
from the ARRL Repeater Directory because there are certain
identical pieces of data that were created (e.g. a deliberate
misspelling of a town name, callsign, etc.) as such in the ARRL
publlished directory to use as a means of identifying data from
the ARRL directory which has been used to create other databases.
The ARRL then claims that using that information is a violation of
their copyright on their Repeater Directory.

Hopefully I've expressed the above correctly...now I delve into my
opinion. Several years ago an almost identical situation arose
having to do with an "independent" telephone white pages provider
who used the white pages of one of the regional telephone companies
as the source for the independent's white pages. The independent
first approached the telephone company and asked to purchase an electronic
copy for the purpose, but the telephone company refused. The
independent then just had all the data manually keypunched into its own
database from an actual "hard copy" of the white pages.
The telephone company was able to "prove" that the independent white
page provider used the telco white pages because they had populated
the telco white pages with certain "bogus" entries for that express
purpose. Not knowing of which entries were bogus, the bogus entries
were readily found in the white pages of the independent white
pages. The case went all the way to the US Supreme Court.

The final resolve of the case was that the white pages was NOT
protected by copyright because it was nothing more than a factual
listing of data that was arranged alphabetically. Factual
information (e.g. my name, address & phone number) can not be
copyrighted and the court decision said that a simple
alphabetical sort/listing of that data did NOT represent a
compilation that would be protectable by copyright. Thus there

is precident for using data from any source (factual data that is)
in another database if there is a valid argument that the data
as presented in the newly created database is either (1) not
of any particularly creative arrangement (e.g. alphabetical, arranged
by state, town, etc.) or (2) is arranged in a different arrangement
(creatively speaking) than the data as presented in the original
database (e.g. the ARRL Repeater Guide).

So, for this specific situation, it seems to me that all the
individual data about any given repeater is not copyrightable
by itself (e.g. input/output freq., location, callsign, attributes,
etc.) and it is only the total compilation of that data for
all the repeaters in a directory that
MAY be copyrightable as a total work where the copyright protects
a uniquely creative way of presenting the data (simple
electronic sorts by band, state, and location don't...IMHO...seem
to be a good example of a creative presentation).

End of legal discussion-------

Frankly, I think an online repeater directory would be a great
benefit to us all. If it was available, especially where the
user might be able to set certain "sort" parameters to derive
a list of repeaters of specific interest to the user. Would
I still buy the ARRL directory? Absolutely...because I keep that
directory in the car, not in the shack anyway. My usual process
is to buy a new directory every other year. Certainly at $6
it isn't a financial reason that most folks would not opt to
purchase their own hard copy directory for the glovebox.

Just my opinion.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ   email via UUCP   bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays   email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

----

Date: Wed, 23 Feb 1994 16:48:49 -0500
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!utcsri!
newsflash.concordia.ca!altitude!dino.hip.cam.org!user@ames.arpa
Subject: Super Morse 4.10 is out!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I read a note somewhere that 4.06 was available from some FTP site.
Well super Morse 4.10 is out and available on Compuserve and possibly

somewhere on the NET. If you can't find it, let me know and if someone
tells me how to get permission to PUT it on their FTP server, I can send it
there.

73 de dino

--
    """"""""""""""""""""""
    | Dino Moriello   """"""""""""""""""""""""
    | PO BOX 105   Internet: dino@CAM.ORG """""""""""""""""""""
    | Radisson,Quebec Compuserve: 76120,1472 Tel.: 514-974-0773 |
    | CANADA J0Y 2X0 Packet: VE2DM@VE2FKB   819-638-8281 |
    ""
    Please E-mail replies since I can't always read the USENET postings.

Date: 24 Feb 1994 17:06:23 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.columbia.edu!
watsun.cc.columbia.edu!jbaltz@ames.arpa
Subject: The *language* requirement!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2kgpoi$rp5@chnews.intel.com>,
Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com> wrote:

>You'll get my vote in a nanosecond if you also include computer
>languages on the approved list.

You speak much assembler through your mouth? Or maybe you whistle Baudot?
(Does that count as music?)

The whole point behind the introduction of a language requirement was that
it be a *spoken* language (since we speak with others) or maybe just a
language whose orthography can be translated into Morse Code unambiguously...

And I thought that *I* was a geek!

//jbaltz
jerry b. altzman   Entropy just isn't what it used to be   +1 212 650 5617
jbaltz@columbia.edu   jbaltz@sci.ccny.cuny.edu   (HEPNET) NEVIS::jbaltz

----

Date: Wed, 23 Feb 1994 20:09:17 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!lerc.nasa.gov!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!col.hp.com!
srgenprp!alanb@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Two meter frequency allocations
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary Davis (gdavis@griffin.uvm.edu) wrote:
: Our University station is struggling with the student association for
: funding and as a result we put a 2 meter- cross band- remote base on
: the air.   ...   Soon we we pounced on by
: the local coordinator who said we were in violation of part 97 since
: what we had was not a remote base, rather a repeater.

: I called ARRL legal counsel and he concluded that we did not have a
: repeater since we do the following:

: 1. turn it on and off when used

: 2. do-not operate or occupy the frequency 24 hours a day

: However, the local coordinator has said that any radio that uses any
: form of automatic T/R switching constitutes a repeater!

Date: Wed, 23 Feb 1994 20:02:49 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Two meter frequency allocations
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary Davis (gdavis@griffin.uvm.edu) wrote:
: Our University station is struggling with the student association for
: funding and as a result we put a 2 meter- cross band- remote base on
: the air. At the time it seemed as if an acceptable input frequency
: would be in the miscellaneous (uses) allocation. We put our input on
: 145.775 (an unused frequency in the area). Soon we we pounced on by
: the local coordinator who said we were in violation of part 97 since
: what we had was not a remote base, rather a repeater.

: I called ARRL legal counsel and he concluded that we did not have a
: repeater since we do the following:

: 1. turn it on and off when used

: 2. do-not operate or occupy the frequency 24 hours a day

: However, the local coordinator has said that any radio that uses any
: form of automatic T/R switching constitutes a repeater!
: Therefore, he contends we are in violation of part 97?
: In any event we change frequencies today, but are there any opinions
: on exactly what constitutes a repeater.

: In my opinion, when the law was enacted, a repeater was construyed to
: be a remote system with inputs/outputs in the same band and not a box
: which is turned on or off before and after use.

: I cannot see how our occupany of the frequency is much different from
: sporatic "simplex" operation.

: 73-- Gary

You're not taking the position that this is an auxiliary operation,
instead, are you? They're illegal on 2. I'd rather admit it was a
repeater, because then you don't have to change bands! But I'm not
really clear on your exact setup.

-drt

|David R. Tucker KG2S   drt@world.std.com|

Date: (null)
From: (null)
     97.3 Definitions
    (a) The definitions of terms used in part 97 are:
  ...
  (7) Auxiliary station. An amateur station transmitting
  communications point-to-point within a system of
  cooperating amateur stations.
  ...
  (34) Repeater. An amateur station that automatically
  retransmits the signals of other stations.

If the station is used in a point-to-point fashion as part of a larger
system, then you can call it an auxiliary station, even if it
has automatic T/R switching. Many groups try to get around the
repeater rules by setting up a "remote base" and defining every
member of the club to be a "control point".

It's clear that such a "system" is really a repeater in disguise.
I don't know if that applies to your group.

AL N1AL

Date: 24 Feb 1994 20:35:09 GMT
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!
scorpion!jbromley@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CLMt8E.3xE@world.std.com>, <2kgpoi$rp5@chnews.intel.com>,
<2kimqf$9e1@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu>d.com
Subject : Re: The *language* requirement!

In article <2kimqf$9e1@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu>,
Jerry B Altzman <jbaltz@watsun.cc.columbia.edu> wrote:

>>I wrote:
>>You'll get my vote in a nanosecond if you also include computer
>>languages on the approved list.

>You speak much assembler through your mouth? Or maybe you whistle Baudot?
>(Does that count as music?)

You would be surprised what I hear over the cubicle walls.

>The whole point behind the introduction of a language requirement was that
>it be a *spoken* language (since we speak with others) or maybe just a
>language whose orthography can be translated into Morse Code unambiguously...

In some universities one may fulfill the foreign language requirement
by learning a computer programming language. And some graduate
programs only require a *reading* comprehension of a foreign language
for admission. Amateur radio might be able to follow their lead.

>And I thought that *I* was a geek!

If you walk like a geek and talk like a geek, you *are* a geek! ;-)

>//jbaltz
>jerry b. altzman   Entropy just isn't what it used to be   +1 212 650 5617
>jbaltz@columbia.edu   jbaltz@sci.ccny.cuny.edu   (HEPNET) NEVIS::jbaltz

    +------------------------+---+
    | Jim Bromley W5GYJ | |
    | Intel Corp. m/s C11-91 | These are my own opinions. |
    | 5000 W. Chandler Blvd. | They are definitely not Intel's. |
    | Chandler,AZ 85226 | |
    | tel: 602-554-5183 | Internet: jbromley@sedona.intel.com |
    +------------------------+---+

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #85
****
****